DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 712 FL 012 400

AUTHOR Anderson, Lee F.
TITLE Research on Teaching Issues in International Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C. National Council on Education Research.
PUB DATE 29 Apr 81
CONTRACT NIE-P-81-0052
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at a meeting of the National Council on Education Research (Washington, DC, April 29, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Global Approach; Humanistic Education; *International Education; *Research Needs; *School Role; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

One of ten studies commissioned to investigate research needs and to stimulate activities, this paper focuses on teaching issues in international education. This encompasses education about the planet, the human species, and the social structures of the world as a whole. The "teaching issues" in question are matters relating to the quality of teachers' own international education, and the quality of schools as teaching and learning environments for international education. On this basis, four sequentially related questions are addressed: (1) the kind of research-based knowledge about teaching issues that is mostly needed by educational policy makers and leaders, with emphasis on the causal relationships between the quality of teachers' international education and that of the students, and the causal relationship between the quality of schooling and the quality of students' international education; (2) the kind of research needed to accomplish this task; (3) how to undertake such studies efficiently in an era of restricted funding; and (4) roles the National Institute of Education (NIE) might usefully play. It is suggested that graduate students and young professors might be interested in doing some of the research and that the NIE staff might synthesize the results and arrange for dissemination. (Author/AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203712

Research on Teaching Issues in International Education; A Paper Prepared for the National Institute of Education

Lee F. Anderson
Professor of Po itical Science and Education
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

I.

Introduction

This paper addressed four sequentially related questions:

1. What kind of research based knowledge about teaching issues is most needed in order to enhance the quality of international education in American schools?

2. What research needs to be undertaken in order to produce this knowledge?

3. How might such research be best undertaken in an era of restricted research funding?

4. What roles might N.I.E. most usefully play in this research effort?

These four questions are addressed because they constitute four significant issues that simultaneously confront at least four groups: (1) educational policy makers at the federal, state, and local levels; (2) school administrators; (3) teacher educators; and (4) educational researchers. They are <u>significant issues commonly shared</u> by these four groups for the following interrelated reasons:

1. In an increasingly global era of world history in which the international position of the United States is undergoing a significant change, improving the quality of the public's international education is becoming an increasingly important challenge.

2. While schools by no means monopolize the public's international education, they do occupy a strategically important position to this process, and hence the quality of the international education provided within schools is a very important component of the overall quality of international education in the society at large.

3. The quality of schools as agents of international education is a function of: (a) the quality of teachers' international education, and (b) the quality of schools as teaching-learning environments for international education.

FL012400

4. The quality of the international education of teachers as well as the quality of schools as teaching-learning environments is partially determined by educational policy at the federal level as well as at the state and local levels; by the practices of school administrators; and by the actions of teacher educators.

5. The quality of educational policy, administrative practices, and teacher education programs is partially determined by the quality of our research based knowledge about the international educational education of teachers and our research based knowledge about schools as teaching-learning environments.

6. The quality of our knowledge about these matters is determined by the kind of research undertaken within the educational research community.

7. The kind of research conducted by educational researchers is partially determined by priorities and policies of N.I.E. and of other public and private institutions engaged in the support and shaping of educational research.

For these reasons the four questions addressed in this paper are significant issues for educational policy makers, school administrators, the educators of teachers, and educational researchers.

Before turning to these four questions themselves, one matter of definition should be briefly addressed. This is the meaning to be attached to the phrase "international education".

For the purposes of designing and conducting research on international education within schools, I do <u>not</u> think we can usefully appropriate the nominal definition of international studies that prevails in higher education. In a recent and excellent assessment of the current state of international studies in American universities, Robert McCaughey, (1980, pp. 381-399) defines international studies to be:

> .....all graduate training and research conducted within American universities relating to states, societies, and cultures other than

the United States and Western Europe. In addition to the study of six major world areas -- Eastern Europe and Russia, East Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America -- the definition comprehends all training and research in the social sciences and humanities on topics of a multinational and international character, such as International Trade, International Relations, Development Studies, and Comparative Studies including at least one "foreign area".

Such a definition is exceedingly restrictive when applied to international education in schools. (And I believe to universities for that matter, but this only indirectly concerns us here.) Moreover, the definition is purely nominal and lacking a coherent conceptual base (e.g., why is a study of Australia or New Zealand or Canada "international studies" while a study of Great Britain is not, or why is Spain and Portugal excluded from the definition while Latin America is included?)

For purposes of researching international education in schools we must proceed from a broad and conceptually coherent conception of the field although within the context of specific studies any given researcher may elect to focus upon only a particular part or facet of the whole. International education can be fruitfully defined as education about the nature of planet Earth, education about the nature of the human species, and education about the nature of the social structure of the world as a whole. Or to put the definition less formally: When do we see international education going on in schools? We see international education when we seen individuals engaged in the task of teaching and learning about the planet, about humankind, and about the social structure of the world as a whole.

This definition has four advantages. One, it accommodates subject matters traditionally associated with international studies at the collegiate level such as area studies and international relations. Two, it admits into the purview of the definition aspects of school curriculum that are not associated with nominal definitions of international studies at the collegiate level such as world geography and world history, but which are in fact two areas of school curriculum that serve as important formal vehicles in the international education of students. Three, the definition sensitizes researchers to the fact that international education is not a particular disciplinary domain within school curriculum or a body of subject matter bounded by a specific content, but rather a dimension that pervades in varying degrees and in differing ways all of a school's formal curriculum. On any given day for any given student some kind of international education, of some kind of quality, is taking place in his or her social studies, science, humanities, practical arts, math, and physical education classes. Fourth, the definition sensitizes the researcher to the fact that international education takes place within the context of a school's "informal" or "hidden" curriculum as well as within the formal curriculum.

II.

What Kind of Research Based Knowledge About Teaching Issues Is Most Needed In Order To Enhance The Quality of International Education In American Schools?

Unfortunately, a good deal of research based knowledge about international education tends to fall into one of two categories. It is either theoretically trivial or it is theoretically interesting but of little or no relevance to the work of educational policy makers, administrators, or practitioners. (See research reviewed in J.S. Bingham, 1979; L. Wilson, 1975; J.L. Tucker, 1977; F.P. Hunkins, 1977; J.P. Shaver and A.G. Larkins, 1974; and K.B. Wiley, 1977.)

To maximize the contribution research makes to the improvement of international education the research must be designed to produce what can be termed "basic knowledge with a practical face".

What are the defining characteristics of "basic knowledge with a practical face"? There are two. First, such knowledge is knowledge about "alterable variables" (to use Benjamin Bloom's very felicitous phrase). This is to say, it is knowledge about things that educational policy makers and educational leaders can change in contrast to things over which they have no power to alter. In the case of "teaching issues" in international education there are two major kinds of alterable variables. One is the international education of teachers and the other is the characteristics of schools as teaching-learning environments. This is to say, that policy makers setting out to improve international education in schools can induce change in the international education of teachers and/or in characteristics of schools as teaching-learning environments, and hence, presumably improve the international education of students.

This points to a second characteristic of knowledge with a practical face. When educational policy makers seek to produce a change in teacher education or in schools as teaching-learning environments they act upon certain causal presuppositions and assumptions. Basic knowledge with a practical face is theory informed knowledge about the relative validity of the causal presuppositions and assumptions on which educational policy and practice is predicated.

Thus, we have arrived at a general answer to the first question with which this paper is concerned; namely, what kind of research based knowledge about teaching issues is most needed in order to enhance the quality of international education in schools? The most needed knowledge is research based knowledge about the relative validity of the causal presuppositions and assumptions undergirding past and current efforts to improve international education: (a) by changing the international education of teachers and/or (b) by changing schools as teaching-learning environments.

What are these presuppositions and assumptions? The history of efforts to improve international education indicates that these efforts rest upon two basic presuppositions and embody five basic assumptions. The two presuppositions can be summarized as follows:

1. There is a causal relationship between the quality of teachers' international education and the quality of their students' international education. Therefore, students' international education can be improved by improving the quality of the international education of teachers.

2. There is a causal relationship between the quality of schools as teaching-learning environments and the quality of students' international education. Therefore, students' international education can be improved by improving the quality of schools as teaching-learning environments for international education.

The five assumptions embodied in extant reform efforts can be summarized as follows:

1. The major defect in teachers' international education is insufficient knowledge about world affairs resulting from insufficient formal education in world affairs. Therefore, the international education of teachers can be improved by increasing their formal education in world affairs.

2. The major defect in teachers' international education is the monocultural context of their education. Therefore, the international education of teachers can be improved by increasing their cross-cultural experiences.

3. The major defect in teachers' international education is the isolation of practicing teachers from the culture of universities and professional educators. Therefore, the international education of teachers can be improved by reducing this isolation through staff development and in-service training programs interlinking schools and universities.

4. The major defect of schools as teaching-learning environments for international education is the inadequacy of curriculum and instructional materials. Therefore, international education of students can be improved by improving the quality of curriculum and instructional materials.

5. The major defect of schools as teaching-learning environments for international education is the dehabilitating effects of the culture of schools. Therefore, the international education of students can be improved by changing the culture of schools.

Summary: This section of the paper has addressed the general question: What kind of research based knowledge about teaching issues is most needed in order to improve the quality of international education in American schools? It has been argued that the most needed knowledge is "basic knowledge with a practical face". This is defined as (a) knowledge about the international education of teachers and schools as teaching-learning environments that (b) facilitates

the assessment, elaboration, and refinement of the basic presuppositions and assumptions undergirding social policies and administrative practices designed to improve international education by inducing change in the international education of teachers and/or in schools as teaching-learning environments. Two such presuppositions and five assumptions have been explicitly identified.

III.

What Kind Of Research Needs To Be Undertaken To Assess The Validity and To Elaborate and Refine These Presuppositions and Assumptions?

In light of the current state of our knowledge about teacher education and about schools as teaching-learning environments it appears that four kinds of research should be given high priority. They are:

1. Research on the linkage between teachers' own international education and the international education of students;
2. Research designed to assess the place schools occupy in the overall ecology of students' international education;
3. Research designed to identify the characteristics of teacher education programs that respectively inhibit and facilitate teachers' international education; and,
4. Research designed to identify the characteristics of the schools as teaching-learning environments that respectively inhibit and facilitate students' international education.

Research on the Linkage Between Teachers' Own International Education and the International Education of Students

Why is the quality of international education in schools low? Because the quality of the international education of teachers is low. Therefore, by elevating the quality of the international education of teachers this will result in turn in an elevated quality of international education in schools.

This is the basic presupposition underlying all social policy aimed at enhancing teacher education in international affairs, whether it be policies to support and encourage travel/study experiences for teachers, policies designed to increase the amount of formal coursework teachers take in international affairs, policies aimed at recruiting into the teaching profession individuals with extensive cross-cultural experience, etc. This presumed linkage between the quality of teachers' own international education and the quality of students' international education is most explicitly stated by Harold Taylor in his classical argument that improving teachers' international education is the way to improving the international education of the public as a whole. Taylor (1970, p. 104) writes:

> I argue for a wider dimension of world thought and feeling in the education of teachers, for their sake first of all, then for the sake of the children and their schools, then for the sake of the improvement of the educational system and the country. That is the order in which the efforts must go. It is the quality and range of the teacher's mind and character which determine the degree of his influence and the form his influence will take. By working out ways in which his education may bring him face to face with cultures, ideas, values, facts, and people outside the range of his ordinary experience, we can make a difference in his life and in the quality of the gifts he brings to teaching. By doing so, and by giving enough teachers a change to think in the bigger terms of world affairs and world issues, we should be able to enliven the entire educational system at a time it badly needs enlivening. Aside from anything else, that seems to me to be a good enough reason for introducing the world and its affairs into the education of American teachers.

To my knowledge, there is nothing in the research literature that frontally assaults the validity of this general claim. But on the other hand, (again to my knowledge) there is nothing in this literature that helps us to empirically refine the claim in a way that may prove useful in developing improved teacher education programs. Specifically, two interrelated types of research are called for.

One is comparative studies of students' international education in classes (or classrooms in elementary schools) under the direction of teachers who differ noticeably in the quality of their own international education as indexed by such variables as foreign travel and study experiences, cross-cultural work or living experiences, formal education in international studies, active involvement in transnational social, political, and religious activities, etc. Since a small but visible number of teachers with a "high" quality of international education co-exist with a large number of teachers with a "low" quality international education, such comparative research is clearly feasible. Such research would be very valuable in helping to answer a very important question. Assuming the existence of some relationship between the quality of teachers' own international education and the quality of the international education of the students they teach, what is the logical character of this relationship? Is a high quality international education on the part of teachers a necessary but not a sufficient condition of high quality international education in classrooms, or is it also a sufficient condition? If it should turn out to be the latter, this would constitute a very powerful argument in behalf of public investment in the international education of teachers.

A second type of closely associated research concerns the "psychological mechanism" interlinking teachers' own international education and the international education of students. Is the key mechanism found in differential attitudes toward the world, in differentiated levels of knowledge about the world, or in different conceptual and perceptual maps of the world? To my knowledge existing research is not very helpful in resolving this issue for two reasons. While there is some research in teachers international attitudes (see particularly J.S. Bingham, 1979 and L. Wilson, 1975) and some research on the global knowledge of senior education majors (Council on Learning, 1981), we have no research on the basic cognitive and perceptual maps of the world that teachers bring into their classrooms. Even more importantly, to my knowledge, we do not have any research systematically relating inter-teacher differences in attitudes, knowledge, and cognitive maps to differences in their own educational experiences and still even more importantly to differences in their classroom behaviors and hence the learning of students.

Again these are matters of substantial impact for teacher education policies and practices. The types of educational experiences leading to accumulated knowledge are not necessarily the same as the same types of educational experiences leading to the formation of certain attitudes, and in turn these are not necessarily the same types of experiences nurturing the growth of certain cognitive and perceptual structures.

These two kinds of research might most usefully be undertaken through three types of very closely linked studies. One is ethnographic studies of teaching in the classes of matched samples of teachers characterized as having respectively a "high" quality international education and a "low" quality international education. A second type of study is in-depth comparative

studies of these two samples of teachers in respect to their knowledge, attitudes, and cognitive/perceptual structures. The third type of study is "life history" studies of the sample of teachers with a high quality international education designed to identify the most "critical" of their educational experiences and the personal and organizational circumstances under which these experiences occurred.

Research Designed to Assess The Place Schools Occupy In The Overall Ecology of Students' International Education

We are beginning to realize that schools are but one agency in an institutionally complex ecology of education (V. Crockenberg and R. LaBrecque, 1977; L. Cremin, 1976; R. Remy, 1978) that includes families, religious organizations, youth groups, neighborhoods and communities, peer groups, the mass media, etc. Unfortunately, we know reasonably little about the place schools occupy in this overall ecology in general and even less about their role in the international education of children and youth in relation to other educative institutions. Such ignorance is of considerable consequence for social policy aimed at enhancing the quality of the public's international education for at least two reasons. On the one hand, we may be placing excessive reliance on schools expecting them to do things they cannot in fact do or do well. On the other hand, we may be underestimating the educative potential inherent in other institutions in the society. Both possibilities warrant research designed to assess the place of schools in the overall ecology of students' international education.

Three types of studies are called for in order to make such an assessment. One is questionnaire/interview studies of the international education of students designed to systematically identify the influence of schools on students' international learning and socialization relative to other educative/socializing agents. Such research could be patterned on some of the extant political socialization research, particularly the work of K. Jennings and R. Niemi (1974).

A second type of needed research is comparative ethnographic studies of schools and non-school settings as environments for international education. Such research would be particularly variable if it were linked to efforts to construct reasonably sophisticated conceptual maps of schools and non-school settings as educational environments. What I have in mind by the latter is partially illustrated by R. Dreeben's (1970) comparison of schools and families as socializing agents and H. Gans' (1967) study of the mass media as an educative institution.

The third type of needed research is ethnographic studies focused upon the interrelationships among schools and other educative institutions. U. Bronfenbrenner's (1979) call for research in "mesosystems" in research on human development illustrates what I have in mind.

Research Designed to Identify the Characteristics of Teacher Education Programs That Respectively Inhibit and Facilitate Teachers' International Education

As noted previously many existing efforts to improve the international education of teachers are grounded in one or more of three assumptions. Let us briefly look at each of these assumptions and then at the type of research that appears needed in order to assess the validity, elaborate and refine these assumptions.

Some teacher education reform efforts are predicated on the assumption that the problem is that teachers on the whole do not have sufficient or adequate knowledge about the world and that the reason teachers lack adequate knowledge is because they do not take enough formal course work in world affairs during their undergraduate and/or graduate education. Therefore, it is argued that the way to improve the international education of teachers is for Colleges of Education and/or state certification agencies to require of teachers more formal course work in world affairs.

There are two kinds of available research findings that on the surface lend support to this diagnosis of the problem and hence to the prescribed remedy. One is the recently completed ETS study of the "global knowledge" of graduating seniors in American Colleges. A 101 item world knowledge test was administered to a random sample of 3000 undergraduates. The 1000 graduating seniors in the sample achieved a mean score of 50.5. Education majors scored a mean of 39.8 -- the lowest of any academically defined sub-group within the sample. (History majors scored the highest mean of 59.3).

Why should education majors score so low? At first blush it might seem that an answer is to be found in another set of research findings. These are the results of surveys taken of the amount of academic work teachers tend to take in world affairs. About a decade ago Harold Taylor reported in his study, The World As Teacher, that "not more than three to five percent (of teachers), according to the best estimates available, have had in the course of their preparation to become teachers in the social sciences or any other area of the curriculum, any formal study of cultures other than their own, or have studied in the field that could properly be described as world affairs". (Taylor,

1970, p. 21). I have found no evidence to indicate that this situation has substantially changed over the past decade. To the contrary, more recent surveys reach much the same conclusion as did Taylor. For example, a mid-1970 survey conducted by the AACTE Commission on Teacher Education (Anderson and Willmon, 1975) reported that only eight percent of teachers had studied other cultures or international concepts.

Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that indeed teachers do tend to be relatively ignorant of world affairs and that they do take little formal course work in world affairs. But can we infer from this conclusion that the solution to the teacher education problem is university and/or state level policy requiring of teachers more formal class work in world affairs? Not necessarily. And this for several reasons.

To begin with, the ETS study cited above strongly suggests that there is not simple linear and necessary relationship between amount of formal course work in world affairs and level of knowledge about world affairs. The study finds:

> Students in vocational/technical training scored 45.00, more than five points above education majors. English/drama/communications majors scored a little less than two points below the mean (48.84), perhaps a reflection of the slant of the test toward the social sciences. Similarly, foreign language majors were just barely below the mean (50.22), quite possibly for the same reason. And finally, business/accounting/finance majors, despite the traditional idea that they have no interest in the liberal arts, scored about a point above the mean (51.35).

If the university I am most familiar with is typical, there is no reason to believe that these academic majors scoring higher than education majors had taken more formal course work in world affairs. Thus, formal course work does not seem to be a necessary condition of greater world affairs knowledge.

The more interesting and policy relevant question is, of course, this one: Is increasing formal course work in world affairs sufficient condition of increased world affairs knowledge? To my knowledge neither the reported ETS findings to date nor any other research permits us to answer this question. It is a question that is worth pursuing. Hopefully, this can be done at least in part through additional analysis of the ETS data.

However, I think that a research agenda on teacher education must proceed on the assumption that simply adding required courses in world affairs to teachers' academic work is not a sufficient condition of substantially enhancing their knowledge of world affairs. I conclude this for two reasons, each of which points to an area of needed research. To begin with, as we all know, formal courses in world affairs are not equally valuable and particularly not equally valuable as a source of knowledge teachers most need. Hence, it is important to ask: Do courses in world affairs specifically designed for teachers serve to substantially enhance their knowledge of students who take them relative to their counterparts who do not? If the answer is yes then this has significant implications for the design of teacher education programs. Fortunately, research on this issue seems feasible. A number of universities (e.g., Indiana University) have international education courses especially designed for teachers.

There is a second and more substantial matter, however, that relates to the issue of the sufficiency of expanding formal course work as a means to producing an internationally more knowledgeable teaching force. This concerns the culture of education as a vocation and the culture of Colleges of Education

as organizations. Harold Taylor in his study of teacher education a decade ago persuasively argued that the culture of the educational establishment tended to be indifferent if not hostile to the socialization and education of internationally sensitive and knowledgeable teachers. Moreover, this is not an isolated culture. Quite to the contrary, the culture of a College of Education is embodied in the culture of the larger university. Here no more than in Colleges of Education are the prevailing conditions conducive to teachers receiving a high quality international education according to Taylor. Taylor summarizes these generally prevailing conditions as follows:

THE GENERAL CONDITIONS

> However, in most of the larger institutions, the number of faculty members and administrators directly interested in the international education of teachers is relatively small and the programs seriously underdeveloped. Few faculty members have read the available literature. Still fewer have applied the conclusions to be found in that literature to the possibilities for the education of teachers. In one case, when I asked a group of twenty-five members of a college of education faculty if there had been any changes in the education curriculum to match the changes in the world society, the question was asked, Why should there be?
>
> On many campuses I found myself answering a flow of questions from faculty members and administrators about what was happening in international education, and what ideas and programs were in operation elsewhere. There were many questions about the Government agencies, most of whose programs in international education and cultural affairs were little known on the campuses, including the work of Congress in preparing and passing the legislation of the International Education Act. There was little indication that the Act itself, with its implications for educational change, even when known, had been taken with the seriousness it deserves. Most of the questions about the new legislation and its provision for a Center for Educational Cooperation had to do with whether there were possibilities for grants to organize new programs and, if so, what form these programs should take in order to match the provisions of the Act.
>
> The diffidence and lack of direct interest in the international education of teachers can be traced to several sources.
>
> In the first place, the idea of general education is now so deeply embedded in the university curriculum and university thinking and the standard pattern of requirements for the first two years and for the B.A. degree so firmly fixed, that it is hard for anyone in the universities to think his way into other notions about how to spend the student's time during the first two and the last two years of college. Since the history of Western civilization in one or another of its versions is considered essential for all, that area of the curriculum is already pre-empted, with little room for other cultures.

It is considered sufficient that courses in international relations, foreign cultures, foreign languages, and world affairs are offered by the departments as electives which students of education can take along with everyone else. The fallacy lies in assuming that education students are interested in taking them, or have any reason to take them as preparation for teaching in schools where there is very little demand for teachers with an international outlook.

Even where there are area studies programs and large research institutes in foreign affairs, these are designed for graduate students and for those undergraduates who intend going on to graduate school and into careers other than public school teaching. With the present disjunction between the graduate school and the undergraduate teaching programs, and the separation of the college or department of education from the main body of the liberal arts college, very little coordination or flexibility exists in arranging curricula for teacher candidates.

It is also true that teacher candidates, owing to the scholastic aptitudes they bring with them to college, are much less likely to be the winners of scholarships or fellowships in the open university competition, and in general have less money to spend on their education than other students. They are therefore less likely than others to take the initiative in trying for a Junior year abroad or to vary in any way the pattern of curriculum which they know will deliver them safely into a teaching post at the end of four years. In consequence, they make few demands of their own for study in foreign affairs, and go unnoticed by the faculty members in the field.

Finally, the conception of study of foreign affairs and international relations held in the academic community is one which is essentially unrelated to the needs or interests of undergraduates, even when the undergraduates are interested in world society and its problems. The courses are constructed as background for an understanding of how scholars in world affairs deal with the problems in their field, not with the way men and women live their lives, or with the way the conflicts of moral and political decision in American foreign policy are related to personal and cultural factors in American life. Grayson Kirk states the case for the conventional work in international studies in the following passage:

> ....it is necessary to consider just what a student of international relations attempts to do. His objectives are many and varied but most of them can be grouped under five main headings. These are: (1) analysis of the various forces which influence the foreign policies of the principal states of the world; (2) critical examination of the method which states use to carry on their business with each other, and the instrumentalities which they have established for that purpose; (3) assessment of contemporary economic, political and legal relations among states, and the trends which they reveal; (4) study of the means by which conflicts among states may be adjusted; and (5) consideration of the legal and moral principles which should govern intercourse among nations.....The focus must be on intergovernmental relations and all things which affect them.

> If the focus must be on intergovernmental relations and all things which affect them, there is very little of interest to students in this dreary procession of analyses, instrumentalities, trends in relations, and consideration of legal and moral principles presented by textbooks and lectures in the world affairs classes. Courses of this kind are generally of little value to the student who is becoming a teacher and who needs to gain a sense of the reality of life in another culture, of the reality of existing conflicts between ideas and ideologies, and to learn something which he can teach to children.

If Taylor's analysis is correct then it seems likely that effective change in the international education of teachers entails a more profound change in the culture of Colleges of Education and in the culture of universities than is implied by the act of simply increasing the amount of formal course work in world affairs required of prospective teachers. This is a matter I will return to in a moment.

A second assumption in which many efforts to reform the international education of teachers rests in that a major defect in teacher education is the monocultural context in which teachers are educated. Therefore, to improve the international education of teachers we must expand their cross-cultural experience. This can be done through foreign travel/study experiences, living/work experiences in domestic sub-cultures other than the teacher's own sub-culture, and through the recruitment into the teaching profession of individuals who have extensive cross-cultural experience prior to entering the profession. (The latter is well illustrated by the efforts of some of the MAT programs in the 1960's and 1970's to recruit returning Peace Corps Volunteers.)

There is a massive body of research literature bearing on this assumption. (For some very recent literature surveys and research reports see B. McKrown, 1981; D.K. Sell, 1981; and R.B. Craig, 1981.) One general conclusion seems to

clearly emerge from this research and that is simply this: Foreign study programs and cross-cultural experiences in domestic settings are not by themselves a sufficient condition of "high" quality international education on the part of teachers. Programs vary in their effectiveness and individual participants are differentially affected by the same program. In short, there continues to be a good deal of ambiguity about what kinds of cross-cultural experiences enhance what kinds of teachers' international education when, how, and why.

There is a third assumption undergirding some efforts to up-grade the international education of teachers. This assumption is that a major defect in teachers' international education is the isolation of practicing teachers from the culture of university scholars and educators. Therefore, the teachers' international education can be enhanced by reducing this isolation through staff development or in-service programs interlinking school and university personnel.

What does extant research tell us about the validity of this assumption? Three general conclusions seem warranted. First, as McLaughlin and Marsh, (1978) note in summarizing the Rand Change Agent Study, "the only concensus that appears to exist about staff development is that what we have now is ineffective and a waste of time. The general feeling is that most staff development programs have benefitted neither teachers nor students." (p. 70). Second, as the National Science Foundation sponsored studies of curriculum innovation point out, teachers tend to perceive university people to be of little value or usefulness in solving their problems. Third, one of the

major reasons why this is the case is found in the fact that problems confronting teachers derive less from the fact that they are isolated from the culture of the university and more from the fact that teachers live in two sociocultural systems and the demands of these respective systems are not necessarily compatible. One is the system of the school and the other is the system of university scholarship. As the NSF Case Studies of Science Education points out, teachers "belong to both systems but they are much less at the mercy of the scholarship system. Scientists and other intelligentsia have little effect; parents and other teachers have much. What teachers do with subject matter....is determined by how it sustains and protects them in the social system (of the school)." (R. Stake and J.A. Easley, Jr., 1978, Vol. 16, p. 23).

I have noted the three basic assumptions undergirding various social policies and practices aimed at improving the international education of teachers and have briefly referred to some of the extant research bearing on these assumptions to indicate that there is sufficient ambiguity about the validity of these assumptions to warrant research designed to further assess, elaborate, and refine these assumptions. In short, research is needed that is clearly designed to identify the characteristics of teacher education programs that respectively inhibit and facilitate the international education of teachers. Specifically, two kinds of studies seem warranted.

The first are comparative ethnographic studies of teacher education programs characterized by differing levels of institutional commitment to enhancing the quality of teachers' international education. There is a large group of Colleges of Education and universities that continue to evidence the characteristics that Harold Taylor described in his 1960 study of the international education of teachers -- institutions with no specific organizational

commitment to the international education of teachers. In addition to these there is now a small but visible and growing number of college and university based teacher education programs explicitly committed to enhancing the quality of the international education of teachers specifically and/or undergraduate students generally including prospective teachers. (Many of these programs are described in the global education publications of the Council on Learning (See Council on Learning, 1980, p. 22 for list of publications).

Thus, there exists at this point in time substantial variance among teacher education programs in respect to this degree of institutional commitment to international education. This provides a "natural experiment" that can be used to identify the characteristics of teacher education programs that respectively serve to inhibit and to facilitate teachers' international education. Perhaps this opportunity can be best exploited through a series of conceptually coordinated and comparative ethnographic studies of different Colleges of Education and/or universities ranked along a continuum from institutions with no explicit organizational commitment to international education to institutions with a very substantial organizatonal commitment.

The second type of research on teacher education programs that is needed relates to staff development or in-service training programs. Here too the circumstances of the time present the opportunity to exploit a "natural experiment". During the past two years several dozen in-service or staff development programs in international education have been underway under the auspices of the NDEA Title VI, Section 603 program. It would be possible to design a systematic comparative evaluational study of these 603 programs.

Some of the necessary data are available in the descriptions of these programs and in the self evaluations undertaken by the project directors. Additional data could be easily obtained through a follow-up study making use of questionnaires, interviews, participant observers, and quasi-ethnographic techniques. The overall objective of such research would be to identify the characteristics of staff development/in-service training programs that do make a difference in the knowledge, attitudes, conceptual structures, and classroom behaviors of teachers. Fortunately, the extant research on staff development and educational change provides the raw materials necessary to construct a reasonably sophisticated conceptual and theoretical foundation for such a study of these projects. (See for example McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978). Thus, the research need not be simply exploratory and descriptive but could be hypothesis testing and theory evaluating and hence of interest to teacher educators who do not have a particular interest in international education as such.

Research Designed To Identify The Characteristics Of Schools As Teaching-Learning Environments That Respectively Inhibit And Facilitate Students' International Education

As noted previously efforts to improve students' international education by changing schools as teaching-learning environments tend to proceed from one of two assumptions. One assumption is that a major defect of schools as agents of international education lies in the fact that curriculum and instructional materials are inadequate, and therefore, international education in schools can be improved by up-grading the quality of curriculum and instructional materials. The other assumption is that the problem is more profound than the formal curriculum as such and derives from the nature of schools as cultural systems. Therefore, enhancing the quality of international

education in schools depends upon changing the culture of schools. Both of these assumptions need to be assessed, elaborated, and refined through research designed to identify the characteristics of schools as teaching-learning environments that respectively inhibit and facilitate students' international education. Specifically, there are three types of closely related studies that seem to be called for.

The first and most general type of needed research are ethnographic studies of schools explicitly focusing upon schools as teaching-learning environments for international education. This type of research is necessary because we do not have anything resembling detailed maps of the ways in which the culture of schools serve to inhibit and facilitate students' international education. Existing research in curriculum, on the legal context of schooling, on instructional materials, and on classroom life gives us some insight but it is fragmented and unsystematic. (See J.L. Nelson, 1976; C.L. Mitsakos, 1978; S.J. Hall, 1978; Asia Society, 1976; Middle East Studies Association, 1975; R.E. Stake and J.A. Easley, 1978; and F.M. Klein, K.E. Tye, and J.E. Wright, 1979). What is needed are systematic, detailed ethnographic maps of schools explicitly focusing upon them as teaching-learning environments for international education.

Perhaps such research might be best undertaken in the following manner. Using the now reasonably extensive normative literature on international education, an "ideal construct" or "ideal model" of an internationalized school could be created (See L.F. Anderson and C. Anderson, 1979 for one example of such a model). This normative construct or model could then be used as a framework for ethnographic observation designed to highlight points

of congruence and incongruence between the ideal model and real schools. The sources within the culture of schools of the congruences and incongruences could then be explored.

A second type of closely related needed research on schools as teaching-learning environments relates to resistance to curriculum innovation within the culture of schools and within the school book publishing industry. Specifically, there is a need to build upon the research on curriculum change sponsored by the National Science Foundation (particularly their case studies in Science Education) and on some of the recent research on change in text books (see for example W. Fetsko, 1979 and J.J. Patrick, 1981) by looking at resistances to curriculum innovation specifically affecting international education. The social studies curriculum is probably of particular relevance here. The traditional scope and sequence within the K-12 social studies curriculum appears to be detrimental to high quality international education in a variety of ways. However, efforts to substantially alter the intellectual architecture of the social studies curriculum have met with substantial resistance that seems to have deep roots in the culture of schools (See L.F. Anderson, 1981).

The third type of research that needs to be done on schools as teaching-learning environments is perhaps the most important. There are currently a growing number of efforts to create "international schools". Some of these are private schools and others are public schools often in the form of "schools within schools". These represent efforts to not only alter curriculum but to create a school culture that facilitates students' international education.

Given the fact that there are likely to be several additional "international schools" established as one response to the report of the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies again researchers have the opportunity to take advantage of a "natural experiment". (See the Proceedings of the National Seminar on the Implimentation of International Schools, 1981.) Specifically, there is an opportunity to systematically compare through ethnographic research "international schools" with "traditional" schools. The purpose of such ethnographic comparison would be to systematically identify and rigorously describe the characteristics of schools that respectively inhibit and facilitate students' international education.

Summary: This section of the paper has addressed the question: What kind of research needs to be undertaken in order to produce the type of knowledge most needed by educational policy makers and leaders who seek to improve international education in American schools? I have identified and briefly discussed four types of high priority research. They are

1. Research on the linkage between teachers' own international education and the international education of students,
2. Research designed to assess the place schools occupy in the overall ecology of students' international education,
3. Research designed to identify the characteristics of teacher education programs that respectively inhibit and facilitate teachers' international education, and
4. Research designed to identify the characteristics of schools as teaching-learning environments that respectively inhibit and facilitate students' international education.

IV.

How Might The Needed Research Be Undertaken In An Era Of Restricted Research Funding?

The research agenda outlined in the previous pages is substantial but I do not believe prohibitively expensive even in an era of severely restricted research budgets. None of the research demands large scale, expensive, national projects. Nor does any of the research call for research skills that are not well developed by many younger members of the educational and social science research communities. Thus, most, if not all of the research called for in this paper, could be executed in the form of reasonable small scale projects undertaken by younger members of the research community at reasonably little expense to N.I.E. or other funding sources. By "younger members of the research community" I have in mind Ph.D. students in education and the social sciences who are doing dissertation research and young "research hungry" assistant professors. In both categories there are many individual scholars who are committed to doing research of some type. Often they have no firm research commitments prior to commencing a given project and hence are "psychologically available" for recruitment into a project.

In short, there exists within universities a pool of research talent that could undertake the research outlined in this paper at reasonably little expense to public funding agencies provided that the individuals with the requisite skills and backgrounds could be first identified, then mobilized, and finally their individual efforts coordinated. It is to this matter that I now turn.

V.

What Roles Might N.I.E. Most Usefully Play In This Research Effort?

N.I.E. could play two types of roles in the research effort described above. First, the agency could supply some of the necessary funding and assist in obtaining commitments from other public and/or private funding sources. Second, N.I.E. could play an indispensably important role in initiating and facilitating the research effort.

Let me briefly outline one scenario depicting how this might be done. A document outlining the research projects N.I.E. desires to be undertaken could be circulated to Colleges of Education and social science departments with major Ph.D. programs. The document would indicate the type and magnitude of funding support available for the projects and invite graduate students at the dissertation stage of their work and younger faculty members to submit brief pre-proposals accompanied by information on the competence of the individuals to undertake the research they propose. The authors of the best of the pre-proposals would be then invited to submit a reasonably detailed research proposal. Assuming the quality of these is satisfactory the selected individuals would then be asked to attend a several day workshop. The purpose of this workshop would be four-fold. One, the proposals would be critiqued by N.I.E. staff, the workshop participants, and any outside "experts" that seemed appropriate and useful. Two, a common extensive bibliography would be prepared for the research team. Three, efforts could be made to conceptually and methodologically coordinate the different projects. Four, on the basis of the critiques and efforts at coordination the proposals would be finalized. At this point the individual researchers would commence work on their

particular project. At the conclusion of this phase of the project (let us say eighteen to twenty-four months later) a senior and experienced researcher (either on the N.I.E. staff or an outsider) would be named and assigned the responsibility of correlating, integrating, synthesizing, and organizing the research coming out of each of the individual projects into a single report on teaching issues in international education. The report would be published as a collaborative venture of the research coordinator and the researchers undertaking each of the individual projects. Finally, the participants could prepare shorter "spin-off" documents based on the overall report directed toward specialized audiences such as teacher educators, school officials seeking to create international schools, educational researchers, educational policy makers, etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, C.M. and J.C. Willmon, eds., Teacher Education and World Awareness (Tuscaloosa, Alabama: College of Education, University of Alabama, 1975)

Anderson, L.F., "Explaining the Absence of Widespread and Substantial Changes in Social Studies Education Within Schools", Report of Project SPAN (Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1981)

Anderson, L.F. and C. Anderson, "A Visit To Middleston's World-Centered Schools: A Scenario", in James M. Becker, ed., Schooling For A Global Age (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979)

Asia Society, Asia In American Textbooks (New York: Asia Society, 1976)

Barker, K., "International Education and the Professional Association", Phi Beta Kappa (January, 1970)

Bronfenbrenner, U., The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments By Nature and Design (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979)

Committee on the University and World Affairs, The University and World Affairs (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1960)

Council on Learning, Educating for the World View (New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1980)

Craig, R.B., "Does Participation in Foreign Study Programs Foster International Attitudes?: The Case of Kent State In Mexico", Paper Prepared for the 1981 Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, March 1981)

Cremin, L.A., Public Education (New York: Basic Books, 1976)

Crockenberg, V. and R. LaBrecque, eds., Culture As Education (Dubuque, Iowa: Kent/Hunt Publishing Company, 1977)

Dreeben, R., On What Is Learned In School (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley, 1968)

Fetsko, W., "Textbooks and the New Social Studies", The Social Studies (March/April, 1979), pp. 51-55.

Gans, H.J., "The Mass Media As An Educational Institution", Television Quarterly Vol. 6 (Spring, 1967), pp. 20-37.

Hall, S.J., Africa In U.S. Schools: A 1977-78 Survey", International Studies Notes of the International Studies Association, Vol. 5, (Fall, 1978), pp. 14-15.

Jennings, M.K. and R.G. Niemi, The Political Character of Adolescence: The Influence of Families and Schools (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974)

Klein, M.F., K.A. Tye and J.E. Wright, "A Study of Schooling: Curriculum", Phi Delta Kappan Vol. 61, No. 4 (December, 1979), pp. 244-248.

Lee, L.L., "Influence of Selected International Education Activities on Teacher Attitudes Concerning Purposes of Education (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alabama, 1968), Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968, 29/10, 3381.

McCaughey, R.A., "The Current Status of International Studies in American Universities: Special Considerations Reconsidered", Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 51, No. 4 (July/August, 1980), pp. 381-399.

McKeown, B., "Attitudinal Effects of International Exchange: Evidence, Interpretation and Evolution", Paper Prepared for the 1981 Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, March, 1981.

Michie, A.A., Higher Education and World Affairs (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1968)

Middle East Studies Association, The Image of the Middle East in Secondary School Texts (New York: Middle East Studies Association, 1975)

Mitsakos, C.L., "A Global Education Program Can Make A Difference", Theory and Research in Social Education, Vol. 6, (1978), pp. 1-14.

Nelson, J.L., "Nationalistic vs. Global Education: An Examination of National Bias in the Schools and its Implications for Global Society", Theory and Research in Social Education, Vol. 4, (1976), pp. 33-49.

Patrick, J.J., "The Current State of Social Studies Curriculum Materials, K-12 Synthesis", Report of Project SPAN (Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1981)

Proceedings of the National Seminar on the Implementation of International Schools (Urbana, Illinois: College of Education, University of Illinois, 1981)

Remy, R., "Social Studies and Citizenship Education: Elements of a Changing Relationship", Theory and Research in Social Education, Vol. 6, No. 4, (December, 1978), pp. 40-57.

Sarason, S., The Culture of Schools and the Problem of Change, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971)

Sell, D.K., "Research in Attitude Change Among Participants in Foreign Study Experiences", Paper Prepared for the 1981 Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, March, 1981)

Stake, R.E. and J.A. Easley, Jr., Case Studies in Science Education, Report to the National Science Foundation (Urbana, Illinois: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation and Committee Culture and Cognition, University of Illinois, 1978)

Taylor, H., The World As Teacher (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1970)

Tucker, J.L., "Research on Social Studies Teaching and Teacher Education", in Review of Research in Social Studies Education 1970 - 1975 (Arlington, Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977)

Walsh, J.E., Inter-Cultural Education in the Community of Man (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1973)

Weiss, I.R., Report of the 1977 National Survey of Sciences, Mathematics, and Social Studies Education, Report to the National Science Foundation (Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Center for Educational Research and Evaluation, 1978)

Wiley, K.B., The Status of Pre-College Sciences, Mathematics, and Social Science Education: 1955-1975, Volume 3: Social Science Education Report to the National Science Foundation (Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, 1977)

Wilson, L., The Attitudes of Elementary Teachers Toward Nationalism and Worldmindedness, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Drake University, 1975